



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/928,292 | 08/10/2001 | David K. Lee | F-259 | 7963 |
| 919 7590 08/20/2008 PITNEY BOWES INC. 35 WATERVIEW DRIVE P.O. BOX 3000 MSC 26-22 SHELTON, CT 06484-8000 | | | | |
| EXAMINER NELSON, FREDA ANN | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3628 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 08/20/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Application No. 09/928,292 | Applicant(s) LEE ET AL. |
| Examiner FREDA A. NELSON | Art Unit 3628 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-10 and 22-24.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

/JOHN W HAYES/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument Gelfer avoids hand-held scanning, the Examiner asserts that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., hand-held scanning) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to Applicant's argument that Gelfer is not disclosing a method for tracking special service delivery by a courier of a mail item, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gelfer discloses a franking machine for use in such a postal system, in accordance with a method for tracking and tracing a piece of mail, has a printer for printing an identity code onto a label identifying one or more pieces of mail (see abstract; ¶ [0009]).

In response to Applicant's argument that the cited art does not disclose or anticipate the following steps of claim 1 namely, automatically detecting at the mail room the special service indicator on the mail item and determining the special service delivery required based on the detection of the special service indicator; applying at the mail room a unique office worker generated identifier to the mail item, the unique identifier including an electronic address of a company server; receiving from the carrier at the electronic address obtained by the carrier from the unique identifier on the mail item information relating to the location of the mail item, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Bennett et al. discloses the Shipper can use the System to locally print on the Shipper's printer device a bar-coded shipping label according the Selected Carrier's certification standards; and in some embodiments, the bar-coded shipping label, including two dimensional bar code labels, and other types of shipping labels, can be printed on either a thermal label printer or on a laser printer (col. 47, lines 53-63; FIGS. 3 and 11). Bennett et al. further discloses the System requests that a System database server, e.g., 20a (as depicted in FIG. 5) locate and retrieve the package record that is associated with the tracking number 19, wherein the System database server, e.g., 20a as depicted in, e.g., FIG. 5, uses the entered tracking number 19 to search the System database 22 to locate and retrieve the specified package record. In one embodiment, the System database server, e.g., 20a as depicted in, e.g., FIG. 5, is programmed to perform database accesses using Sequel 7.0 (col. 54, lines 46-62; FIG. 69). Bennett et al. still further disclose status 2071 reports the Delivery Status, also referred to as the Track, or Tracking, State; Last Scan 2072 reports Last scan information for the particular package; and when a package is moved from one location to another, the label of the package is scanned according to each Carrier's processing requirements. Also, many Carriers scan package labels when packages are received by the recipients. Delivered To 2073 reports the person or place to which the package was delivered (e.g., left with receptionist, receptionist front desk, or guard) (col. 56, lines 29-49).

In response to applicant's argument that in regards to claim 8, the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., delivering digital images after they have been captured by a carrier) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that in regards to claim 22, the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., receptacle that contains mail items while the receptacle is transported in the delivery process) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that in regards to claims 23-24, the art cited by the Examiner does not disclose or anticipate determining the location of the mail item is by knowing the location of the receptacle, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Gelfer discloses in a further development one or more readers can be provided at one or more different delivery stations for reading the identity codes, thus allowing monitoring of the exact route of the piece of mail. This enables the sender to always check where a piece of mail currently appears and facilitates tracking and tracing if any piece of mail gets lost during delivery ([0009]). Gelfer further discloses one or more of the carriers 5, 6, 7 can be equipped with a reader 15 for reading the identity codes during delivery of the mail in order to register and monitor each station during delivery. An immediate response can also be sent back to the postal service 1 and, if required, to the sender 2, 3 or 4 ([0019]).